THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

December 12, 1984

AM
10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings: 16 January 1985 (Wednesday)
19 February 1985 (Tuesday)

B. Approval of November 14, 1984 minutes of the Commission of Fine Arts.

II. SUBMISSIONS

A. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA 12/DEC/84-1, Embassy of Canada; Final designs for Chancery on Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., and John Marshall Park.

2. CFA 12/DEC/84-2, Sculpture, proposed for John Marshall Park; replica of John Marshall statue in Supreme Court Building.

3. CFA 12/DEC/84-3, J.W. Marriott Hotel; Pennsylvania Avenue & 14th Street, N.W.; sidewalk cafe.

B. National Park Service, National Capital Region

CFA 12/DEC/84-4, East Executive Avenue, Presidents Park; Removal of existing roadway, new gateways, new pedestrian walks & landscape plans.

C. National Capital Planning Commission

CFA 12/DEC/84-5, Constitution Avenue, Independence Avenue: Draft Special Street Plans.

D. Georgetown Business and Professional Association

CFA 12/DEC/84-6, Whitehurst Freeway; Community alternative proposal. Informational presentation.

AM 11:00

E. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 85-43, 1673-1679 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.; New apartment/retail complex; conceptual design, (previous: O.G. 85-25).

2. O.G. 85-31, 1670 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.; Two additional stories to existing one story building; conceptual design.

3. O.G. 85-33, 3350 M Street, N.W.; Forrest/Marbury Associates, Commercial/residential restoration and major new construction; conceptual design.

4. O.G. 85-35, 1042, 44 & 46 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.; Renovation, demolition, and new hotel; conceptual designs.

5. O.G. 85-36, 3270 M Street, N.W.; Georgetown Park Phase II, design development; conceptual designs, (previous: O.G. 85-18).

6. O.G. 85-37, 29th & K Streets, N.W.; New apartment building; revised conceptual designs, (previous: O.G. 85-11).

7. O.G. 85-41, 1057 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.; Renovation and restaurant addition; conceptual design, (previous: O.G. 85-13).

8. O.G. 85-44, 3601 O Street, N.W.; Georgetown University, proposed new residence; conceptual design.

Appendix I.

Shipstead-Luce Act

Appendix II.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 84-240	3012 Cambridge Place, N.W. Michael P. Novelli	Rear deck railing

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Insufficient information. This case was held beyond the forty-five day limit because of repeated promises to supply the additional information requested. It has not been received as of this date.

O.G. 84-259	3028 N Street, N.W. Mr. & Mrs. Kramer	Residential addition & remodeling

ACTION: VOID. Refer to O.G. 84-232.

O.G. 84-265	1042 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Morris Fisher	Restaurant conversion

ACTION: VOID. Superseded by O.G. 85-35.

O.G. 85-07	3700 O Street, N.W. Georgetown University	Demolition

ACTION: No objection to garage demolition required to permit construction of approved new student housing structures because there is no effect on the historic district as visible from public space.

O.G. 85-24	1409 29th Street, N.W. Mr. G. Spingarn	Swimming pool

ACTION: Issue permit. No objection because of limited visibility.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 85-27	3139 O Street, N.W. James & Ann Lowenstein	Rear addition

ACTION: Issue permit. No objection because of limited visibility.

O.G. 85-29	3540-44-48-52-56 Reservoir Rd., N.W. Porten-Sullivan	New garages

ACTION: Issue permit for new garages to conform to previously approved plans and material samples.

O.G. 85-30	3406 P Street, N.W. O'Bannon residence	Renovations & repairs

ACTION: Issue permit. No objection to repair and renovation of rear porch areas.

O.G. 85-32	1050 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W. Bernard Gerwirz	Internally-illuminated sign

ACTION: Issue permit for revised sign design with finished end panels.

O.G. 85-34	1256 31st Street, N.W. Marvin Jawer	Renovations & new roof deck: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to proposed roof deck and doors. Recommend that the deck railing be held back from the roof edge somewhat to keep it from looking like an architectural feature of the original building.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
*O.G. 85-11	29th & K Streets, N.W. Matthews & Walde, Inc.	New apartment building: Conceptual

ACTION: The submitted design concept is disapproved. This gateway site to Georgetown requires a more suitable design, material and construction. There is no objection to the building height, geometry, or the general design of the courtyard on 29th Street. Recommend restudy of tower and facades especially on K Street and particularly in respect to those floors above the level of the Whitehurst Freeway. Resubmit for additional concept study review.

---

*O.G. 85-12	1001 30th Street, N.W. Trammel Crow Company	Demolition of temporary structure: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to the demolition of the existing concrete block structure or to the conceptual design of the proposed new office building as modified and approved by the Board 12 November 1984. Submit working drawings and material samples to the CFA for approval prior to issuance of permit.

---

* O.G. 85-13	1057 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. R.A.K. Inc.	Addition & renovation: change from residential to commercial: Conceptual

ACTION: The Board recommends against the proposed project as submitted because of the negative effect it would have on the existing historic structure, its rear yard, and the adjacent C & O Canal National Historical Park. The complete replacement of the existing open space for the proposed one story restaurant structure is at variance with both the adjoining residential buildings and the historic setting of the C & O Canal. The Board recommends that the applicant maintain the residential quality of the existing building, and that any new construction respect the character of the Canal and the existing open space.

O.G. 85-18	3270 M Street, N.W. Georgetown Park II Associates	New retail building & plaza: Conceptual

ACTION: Case withdrawn from consideration prior to final action by written instruction to the District of Columbia Permit Branch by the applicant. Georgetown Board reviewed designs on November 7, 1984 and advised the Commission of Fine Arts not to approve the design at its November 14, 1984 meeting. The Board's advice to the Commission was as follows: "Though revised designs had a more suitable connection between the C & O Canal towpath, the project area, and the Fishmarket Square, and the relationship between the Market Building and grade had been somewhat improved, a proposed parking garage ramp on public space to the rear of the Market would have a very unfortunate effect on the historic building and its setting. This is in conflict with the Commission's previous recommendations that the setting and ground plane of the Market be retained."

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 85-25	1673-1679 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Aramus Corp.	Addition & alteration: Conceptual

ACTION: Case withdrawn from consideration prior to final action by written instruction to the District of Columbia Permit Branch by the applicant. Georgetown Board reviewed designs on November 7, 1984 and advised the Commission of Fine Arts not to approve the design at its November 14, 1984 meeting. The Board's advice to the Commission was as follows: "The Board recommends against the proposed project as submitted because of the negative effect it would have on the existing historic structures and rear yards, and on Reservoir Road, a one block long residential street with limited traffic. The scheme as presently conceived would require at least partial demolition of all three of the existing historic structures, and would replace in entirety the existing open space with new construction. In the opinion of the Board the character and size of the proposed structure, a four-story hotel with shops and underground parking, is at variance with the adjoining building and the structures to which it is to be attached. The Board recommends that the existing buildings be preserved, and that any new construction be of a scale and character that respects the adjoining buildings and existing open space."

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 85-39	3800 Reservoir Road, N.W. Georgetown University	Student housing

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed new student housing as shown on construction drawings received and dated 30 November 1984.

O.G. 85-40	1715 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Japan Inn	New signage

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed projecting sign as shown on drawings received and dated 30 November 1984. Wood sign will have downcast lighting.

O.G. 85-42	3300 Q Street, N.W. George Copanos	Two story garage

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed new garage with overhead guest quarters and adjacent gallery with sidewalk screening wall as shown on drawings received and dated 30 November 1984. Erect on site brick and mortar sample for inspection and approval by Commission of Fine Arts.

O.G. 85-47	1524 35th Street, N.W. Sisters of the Visitation of Georgetown	Fence

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed wood slat fence as shown on drawing received and dated 3 December 1984.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 85-07	3021 Oregon Knolls Drive, N.W. Crest-In-The-Park General Partnership	Construction of new single-family detached houses: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to design of proposed new house. Submit for final approval upon completion of working drawings.

---

*S.L. 85-08	3025 Oregon Knolls Drive, N.W. Crest-In-The-Park General Partnership	Construction of new single-family detached houses: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to design of proposed new house. Submit for final approval upon completion of working drawings.

---

*S.L. 85-09	3006 Oregon Knolls Drive, N.W. Crest-In-The-Park General Partnership	Construction of new single-family detached houses: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to design of proposed new house. Submit for final approval upon completion of working drawings.

---

*S.L. 85-10	3023 Oregon Knolls Drive, N.W. Crest-In-The-Park General Partnership	Construction of new single-family detached houses: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to design of proposed new house. Submit for final approval upon completion of working drawings.

---

*S.L. 85-11	2500 Calvert Street, N.W. Shoreham Hotel Limited Partnership	Parking garage: Conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept which conforms to previous approvals, S.L. 85-04 and S.L. 84-65. Submit working drawings and material samples when ready for review and approval by Commission of Fine Arts.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 85-15	2346 Mass. Avenue, N.W. Robert C. Haft	Alterations & additions

ACTION: Issue permit for alterations and additions to existing house and grounds as shown on drawings received and dated 11/30/84.

S.L. 85-16	2100 P Street, N.W. G.C. Bruzzo	Sidewalk cafe

ACTION: Not in CFA jurisdiction. No objection to design concept as shown.

S.L. 85-16B	435 1st Street, S.E. Larry & Linda Nelson	Carriage house conversion

ACTION: Issue permit for conversion of existing carriage house to 1(one) bedroom dwelling unit as shown on drawings received and dated 7 December 1984.

S.L. 85-19	200 C Street, S.E. Capitol Hill Associates Ltd.	Retaining wall reconstruction

ACTION: Issue permit for stucco-finished concrete block retaining wall as shown on drawing received and dated 7 December 1984.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

12 December 1984

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Sondra G. Myers Hon. Walter A. Netsch Hon. Edward D. Stone, Jr.
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. Ronald Wilson
D. C. Historic Preservation Board staff present:	Mrs. Tanya Beauchamp

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 16 January 1985 (Wednesday)
19 February 1985 (Tuesday)

B. Minutes of 14 November 1984 meeting, approved.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA 12/DEC/84-1, Embassy of Canada; final designs for chancery on Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., and John Marshall Park. The Assistant Secretary introduced James Rich from PADC; Mr. Rich said the

PADC design board had reviewed the plans the previous day and had been encouraged by them and pleased with the changes made. He then introduced the ambassador from Canada, Allan Gotlieb, who told the members that the recently elected prime minister was in full support of the project and that it would go ahead in the coming year. The Chairman responded that he was convinced that an excellent design would be achieved on this important site, and he said he found the prime minister's position very encouraging.

The architect, Arthur Erickson, was unable to be at the meeting; therefore, the presentation was made by Keith Loffler from his Toronto office. Mr. Loffler showed slides of the original model (seen by the Commission in May 1984) and of the current one, to bring the members up to date on changes that had been made. In general, there was more emphasis on horizontality; the vertical slot windows had been replaced with horizontal bands of windows divided with vertical mullions, and the multi-level penthouse with its gable element had been reduced to a simple, one level structure that reinforced the horizontality of the roof. The building had been reduced slightly in height; Mr. Loffler showed a slide of the John Marshall Park elevation and pointed out that the upper section over the rotunda had been reduced in depth, thus improving the proportions. The C Street façade had changed and was characterized by a large recessed area in which bands of windows were placed, and by a projecting, curved bay with a glass roof. The Pennsylvania façade had also been modified, and there was a repetition here of the horizontal window bands and a recessed area, as well as two large rectangular windows. Mr. Loffler said final plans for this elevation had not been worked out. An important change was an additional entrance, directly from Pennsylvania Avenue. The original design had shown only a business entrance at C Street and a ceremonial entrance from the John Marshall Park courtyard via a driveway from Pennsylvania Avenue. Mr. Loffler pointed out that a glass canopy had been added to the area between the "bridge" and the colonnade at the courtyard entrance, thus providing cover for distinguished guests arriving by car. The rotunda at the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and John Marshall Park was basically unchanged, although the details of the fountain in the center had been worked out.

The Chairman said at this point that he hoped the courtyard entrance would not be allowed to become a parking lot, and Ambassador Gotlieb said he would take note of this request. Mr. Loffler said parking would not be a problem as two full levels of underground parking would be provided. He then discussed the security gates planned for the courtyard and Pennsylvania Avenue entrances. He said that current thinking was that the gates at the avenue entrance would fold back and sink into the ground when not in use. They would be five feet high and made of cast aluminum. The Chairman said he thought the Commission would be highly in favor of having gates that could disappear from view during normal working hours.

Mr. Loffler then discussed the materials. He said the idea of combining aluminum panels with the basic limestone material had been abandoned, and the entire building would now be faced with a whitish, grey-mottled Canadian marble, actually a limestone. Cast aluminum would remain as the material for the colonnade and the rotunda columns would be constructed of concrete. The windows were shown as butt-jointed with only a thin band of stainless steel around them. Mr. Loffler showed a sample of the glass, which had a greenish tint. He also showed a sample of the stone, noting that the finish would be sandblasted, and adding also that rounded corners would be used throughout the building.

The Chairman asked Mr. Rich if the PADC design board had had any objections to the new entrance on Pennsylvania Avenue, and Mr. Rich said they had not; he added that there was a request to see details of the security fence. The Chairman said the Commission was pleased with the design as modified and would approve it, although it was expected that final façade and fence details would be seen when completed. The Chairman and the other members thanked Ambassador Gotlieb for attending the meeting and again expressed their pleasure that such an excellent design had been developed for this important site. Exhibit A

2. CFA 12/DEC/84-2, Sculpture proposed for John Marshall Park; replica of John Marshall statue in Supreme Court Building. Staff member Sue Kohler said that the original statue, the work of William Wetmore Story in 1884, had been on the west terrace of the Capitol until it was moved at the time of the Presidential Inaugural in 1980. Because of weathering problems, it was placed inside the Supreme Court building. She showed drawings of the proposed location for the replica--at the north end of John Marshall Park near C Street. The representative from PADC then discussed the proposed base. He said it would be lower than the original, only 3 feet 2 inches high; the statue is 8 feet 6 inches in height. The Chairman was not sure the base would be high enough and it was recommended that a mockup in silhouette be made showing the proposed and a higher base before making any final decisions. He also noted that when final base details were worked out, perhaps some paneling or moulding should be used to give strength to the large mass of the base and better complement the sculpture.

Mrs. Kohler remarked that if the original statue were to be used to make the replica, permission would have to be granted by both the Chief Justice and the Architect of the Capitol. The representative from PADC said the Chief Justice had agreed to the use of the statue, and the Chairman said the Commission would give its final approval when the concurrence of all those involved had been obtained. The concept and the position within the park were approved. Exhibit B

3. CFA 12/DEC/84-3, J. W. Marriott Hotel; Pennsylvania Avenue & 14th Street, N. W.; sidewalk cafe. Mrs. Kohler showed drawings

for this cafe, to be located along the E Street façade of the hotel. It would be 66 feet in length, 12 feet deep, and leave 10 feet of sidewalk clear. There would be two serving stations within the cafe space, and large natural colored canvas umbrellas of European design to shade the tables. There would be no permanent structural elements. The members thought the cafe would be an attractive addition to the avenue and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit C

B. National Park Service, National Capital Region

CFA 12/DEC/84-4, East Executive Avenue, President's Park; removal of existing roadway, new gateways, new pedestrian walks, and landscape plans. Staff member Jeffrey Carson told the members that because of heavy visitor traffic and security requirements, the Park Service was proposing the conversion of this street to a pedestrian walkway. He introduced James McDaniels, Associate Regional Director for the White House Area of the Park Service to begin the presentation. Mr. McDaniels said there had been concern about this street for some time as it was heavily used by White House visitors on foot, as well as by vehicles, and there was a potential for accidents. Recently, he said, vehicular traffic was restricted and a plan to improve the aesthetics of the White House entrance drawn up. He then introduced Merrick Smith, the Park Service's senior landscape architect, to discuss the plan. Mr. Smith said that because of the growing security problem the initial plan had been revised to include the option of closing off the street with gates at both ends. He said the gates would normally remain open, and there would be no change in the visitors' queues. There would be a vehicular roadway for restricted use by cars and, infrequently, by buses on the occasion of state dinners or other special events. Mr. Smith pointed out the proposed changes on a drawing: The sidewalk next to the Treasury fence would be removed and replaced by a grass panel and trees; adjoining this would be a 12 foot wide vehicular roadway, a central grass panel 23 feet wide, and lastly, a 20 foot wide pedestrian walk with trees, next to the White House fence. The grass panel would be underlaid with a reinforcement, with a porous structural base beneath, so that it could be parked on when necessary. In answer to a question, Mr. Smith said it would be used only for overflow parking for special occasions. The Chairman was concerned that the grass would not be able to take frequent parking use without the underlayment beginning to show. He also questioned Mr. Smith about the logistics of getting guests to the entrance under cover; Mr. Smith said cars would continue to drive through the porte cochère, although the buses might not be able to do so. The Chairman also commented on the fountain opposite the porte cochère, thinking it might not be large enough. Rather than risk its taking on the appearance of a small ornament, he suggested using just the pool with a bubbler in the center, the final design best determined by mock-up on site. At this point he told Mr. Smith how pleased the Commission had been with the way the Visitors' Security Facility on this street had turned out, and how well it had been nestled into the hillside.

Mr. Smith then discussed the design of the information kiosks to be placed at each entrance. Designed to be in harmony with the gates, they would be constructed of metal and lexan with copper roofs; the copper would be treated to turn green in a short time. He said lighting in the area had not been fully studied, and in response to a question, said the existing trees were not uniform and might be replaced with scarlet or pin oaks. In looking at the design for the gates the Chairman had one concern: He thought there was a rather heavy grouping of vertical elements at the pedestrian entrances. He suggested that perhaps fewer lanterns or lighter treatment above the 30 inch security height would help. In general, the members were pleased with the plans and unanimously approved them, with details to be seen later. Exhibit D

C. National Capital Planning Commission

CFA 12/DEC/84-5, Constitution Avenue, Independence Avenue: Draft special street plans. Mr. Carson noted that the staff had read this NCPC report and that copies were in the members' folders. He said, first, that he wanted to call attention to the proposed narrowing of Independence Avenue by one lane to allow for two rows of trees on each side. Then he said that in reading the report, several items had caused concern, and that he would like to ask Donald Jackson, present from NCPC, to discuss them. These items were: (1) Lighting: the change in position of the Washington double globe street lamp from parallel to perpendicular to the curbline, and the grouping of these lights at building entrances; (2) Modification of intersections: while the smoothing out and planting of the Maryland/Independence intersection (similar to what was done at the Pennsylvania/Constitution intersection) seemed an improvement, the blocking of the Virginia/Constitution intersection with a planting bed seemed arbitrary and awkward for traffic; (3) Sidewalks: widening in front of the National Academy of Sciences building on Constitution Avenue would necessitate the destruction of existing landscaping; and (4) Street trees: why the change from a variety of oak to green ash on Independence Avenue?

Mr. Jackson said in regard to the lighting that it was felt that turning the double globe lamp would make its decorative features more visible to those walking or driving along the avenues and would also show off banners or flags to better advantage. The use of two rather than one fixture would be confined to entrances to major buildings, special areas, plazas or intersections. As to the Virginia/Constitution Avenue intersection, Mr. Jackson said Virginia Avenue was a very special street because of its relationship to the Washington Monument, and its terminus should be suitably marked. He did not think that having traffic turn right at 18th Street would cause a problem. The problem of widening the Constitution Avenue sidewalk in front of the National Academy of Sciences did not seem to Mr. Jackson to be as severe as it would first appear. He said many of the trees along the sidewalk were in bad condition and should be removed, and others could be left and protected with

tree grates. He added that there was a possibility of using a gravel walk at the terrace level to facilitate entry to the Einstein statue. In regard to the use of ash instead of oak trees on Independence Avenue, Mr. Jackson said a tree with a large canopy and columnar trunk, similar to but distinct from the American elms used traditionally on Constitution Avenue, was needed, and this seldom-used ash seemed the best choice. He added that confining the elm plantings to Constitution Avenue was the best way to control spread of the Dutch elm disease. The Chairman asked if the zelkova had been considered; Mr. Jackson said it had but was not large enough.

Mr. Jackson then mentioned two other features of the plan: the attempt to control vendors by confining them to vest-pocket areas, and the plan to continue Constitution Avenue to the Potomac River. He recalled that it had been cut off when part of the West Leg of the highway system was built in the 1960's. He closed by saying that NCPC's plan was not oriented towards solving traffic problems, but tried to address aesthetics and the monumentality of the area. He said this was not a master plan but rather a guide plan for the two avenues. The Chairman said the members would read the report and give it careful study, as these avenues were among the most important in the Capital. He thanked Mr. Jackson for his presentation. No action was required.

D. Georgetown Business and Professional Association

CFA 12/DEC/84-6, Whitehurst Freeway; community alternative proposal. Informational presentation. The Chairman recalled that this presentation had been requested by member Alan Novak, who thought the Commission should hear about it. The Assistant Secretary recalled that the Commission had reviewed various District proposals in May and, as between the proposals submitted, had preferred the simplest alternative--widening and repairing the existing freeway. He said the city had subsequently adopted this plan, although officials were aware of the Business and Professional Association's scheme and had discussed it with them. He added that the Georgetown Board had also reviewed it. Richard Stauffer from the Association was introduced and told the members that his group felt that the District's solution did not address some major problems. He introduced planner Alan Vorhees and architect Joseph Passoneau to discuss their alternative.

Mr. Voorhees discussed the problems of maintaining through traffic in Georgetown, noting the excessive number of cars and pedestrians on M Street, especially during non-peak hours and on the weekends, when most visitors come to Georgetown. He said the most important element in the Association's solution was a tunnel, a typical Washington underpass, under K Street from 33rd to 30th Street to handle Key Bridge and Canal

Road traffic; secondly, a better connection would be provided at the east end of Georgetown to Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, whose approaches were relatively underused. The freeway would be removed and traffic directed to K Street, into the tunnel or at grade.

Mr. Passoneau commented that the Whitehurst interchanges and unused freeway section took too much land and the viaduct itself resulted in a badly used tube of space--dark and conducive to crime. He said a K Street boulevard could be an asset, and noted the Ramblas in Barcelona as an example. He said through traffic would go into the tunnel, with no stoplights, and local traffic would stay at grade. In answer to a question from the Chairman, he said there would be no grade problem coming from Key Bridge and no water problem with the tunnel, as had been charged by critics. He added that the economic benefits of improved traffic and pedestrian circulation and an attractive development of K Street would offset the higher cost of this solution. Preliminary cost analyses had been made and it was not felt that this proposal would be anywhere near as much more expensive as had been originally assumed.

The Chairman commented that the Commission had seen only preliminary drawings in May, and that models of the various schemes had been requested; he thought the same applied to this proposal if it were to be really understood. He said that visually the scheme was good and would be beneficial economically in the long run. Mr. Netsch said he had been appalled at the city's proposal for decorating the Whitehurst structure in an attempt to make it more attractive, and he thought this proposal sounded reasonable; he asked what the possibilities were for its consideration. The Chairman said someone would have to put up the extra money. The Secretary said whatever scheme was chosen would be financed primarily from Federal highway funds; he added that although the city had already picked another scheme, the Georgetown group had been in touch with the Mayor regarding their proposal. In answer to a question from Mr. Netsch, he said there was no way of knowing at present whether the city would consider the alternative. Richard McCooey, president of the Business and Professional Association, said he had talked with the Mayor, that there was a crisis situation at this point because of the Georgetown Harbour project, and he hoped that the Commission would write a letter to the Mayor asking that this alternative be given consideration. The Chairman said the Commission would be happy to comply with this request. Exhibit E

E. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs.

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 85-43, 1673-79 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W.; new apartment/retail complex; conceptual design (previous: O.G. 85-25). The Assistant Secretary noted first that reports from the Georgetown Board covering the eight Georgetown projects on the agenda were in each member's folder. Then he discussed the first submission, observing that there were numerous citizens present who were interested in it and in some of the other Georgetown cases as well. He said this proposal was for a condominium apartment at the southeast corner of Wisconsin Avenue and Reservoir Street; the project would include the retention of several old residential-scale buildings on Wisconsin Avenue which would continue to have retail space on the ground floors and apartments above. The new construction would occur in the rear yards and open space to the east, and it would consist of a four story building with a glass mansard roof, housing eight apartments and providing underground parking. He said the plans as submitted at this meeting called for the demolition of the old building on the corner, but the Georgetown Board had rejected this and it would be restudied. He added that the Board had previously rejected another scheme, submitted by the same architect and developer, for a 45 room hotel on the site and the substantial demolition of all the old buildings; that scheme was withdrawn. He said 45 letters had been received in opposition to the hotel scheme and two in favor. A number of letters had also been received in opposition to the condominum proposal. He noted for the record that the Commission had seen the site and then summarized the Georgetown Board's report. He said there were two principal concerns: first, whether the open space at the rear of the old houses should be completely filled in or whether it should be built on at all. Secondly, in regard to the design, there had been questions as to the overall size, massing of the east and west elevations, and the use of a glass mansard roof. Thirdly, the Board disapproved the demolition of the corner building. The recommendation was to limit the construction to three stories, use a conventional roof with dormers, modulate the east elevation down toward the residential structures on Reservoir Street, and restudy the west elevation to avoid the flat end look.

William Cochran, the architect, was then introduced. He reviewed the hotel scheme, its unpopularity, and the difficulty of providing servicing and parking on a residential street. Turning to the new scheme, he said the vote on it at the Citizens Association meeting had been very close, and he agreed with the Board that it needed some modification, particularly the glass roof. He said he was studying the possibility of retaining the corner building and using its small scale to reinforce the character of the other old buildings.

The Assistant Secretary then asked Mrs. Kohler to give the members the results of her research on the corner building. She said the research had been particularly difficult because of the vagueness of early tax records in assigning locations to buildings. She said there were frame

buildings in the immediate area as early as 1800, and at this point she thought the building might have been moved to the site, probably from a point just to the north, when Reservoir Street was cut through to Wisconsin Avenue. She said that from visual examination she would date the structure in the very early nineteenth century, and that possibly it represented the joining of two smaller structures.

Mr. Netsch asked Mr. Cochran about an opening from Reservoir Street behind the old buildings; he was told it was a paved driveway to the underground parking, not green open space. Mr. Netsch also asked about the relationship of this parking entrance and the patio above it to the rear of the old house; he told Mr. Cochran that the drawings and presentation were not clear as to just what would occur in that area. There was no further testimony from Mr. Cochran, and the Chairman asked if anyone from the community would like to comment. The Assistant Secretary introduced Mrs. John Boyd, who first thanked the Commission for the gracious response to the numerous letters and questions from the community. She said that to save time, she would ask those present who opposed the development simply to raise their hands, and then she asked that a petition against the project signed by 225 residents be presented to the Chairman. Next she requested that Mrs. Cameron read a resolution passed at the 10 December 1984 meeting of the Citizens Association of Georgetown. The resolution opposed the development as too large and taking too much open space; any demolition of old buildings on the site was also opposed. In the absence of Wynant Vanderpool, president of the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown, Mrs. Boyd read that organization's official statement; it opposed demolition of the corner building, criticized the development as out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood, and asked that any new construction on the open space along Reservoir Street be disapproved. She then read a brief statement summarizing the views of the community. It said that residents were becoming concerned about the deteriorating quality of life in the small--ten blocks square--Georgetown Historic District. She noted the massive projects being proposed for locations bordering residential areas and said the issue went beyond Reservoir Street to the entire historic district. She said there was an increasing concern that further development would obliterate the remaining open space, and in the interest of future generations, urged the Commission to disapprove the proposed development on this site.

One more person asked to speak. He was Alexander Hawes, a resident of Reservoir Street, and former president of the Citizens Association, who pointed out that although Mr. Cochran had said he was attempting to scale his building to the houses on Reservoir Street, in fact they were all only two stories high, to the point where the grade dropped and a group of three story houses began. He said the roof lines were not much more than half as high as the proposed condominium.

The Chairman thanked Mrs. Boyd and the others for their well organized and brief presentation, and the members then turned to a discussion of the project. The Chairman began by asking if the Commission could agree with the points made by the Georgetown Board and there was unanimous consent. Mr. Netsch said that any further submissions should include elevations that would show other buildings on both streets and not leave the scale problem to conjecture. The Chairman added that although the plan showed what seemed to be open space along Reservoir Street, in reality it was only a garage entrance and not open space in the traditional sense of garden treatment. He said he thought the design was far from being acceptable at this point. Mr. Netsch thought that since three historic buildings, belonging to Georgetown's early period, were involved, any new construction that touched them had to be responsive and maintain their integrity; he also thought the owner should restore them properly. He suggested that perhaps the new construction could be turned so that the units would face a green space between them and the old houses. Mr. Stone, too, indicated his concern about the constant infilling of open space. He said the Commission had been battling this for years, but he wasn't sure what an agency such as this could do about it. Mr. Netsch agreed and said other groups should get involved since the Commission was not a legislative body; it could disapprove, but had to review what the city government submitted to it. The Chairman said the Commission had done that, and he thought there was unanimous consent that this submission was disapproved. Mr. Stone said he would carry Mr. Netsch's request for more inclusive elevations a step further and ask for an entire street elevation so the difference in scale could be clearly seen. The Chairman said Mr. Stone's request should not be construed to mean that there had to be a further submission of this project. Exhibit F

2. O.G. 85-31, 1670 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.; two additional stories to existing one story building, conceptual design. Mr. Carson said the design of the additional stories would carry on the rhythm of existing architectural features. He reported that the Georgetown Board was willing to go along with the design but was concerned about the height. Mr. Netsch thought the building was already an intrusion on the environment and saw no reason to make it more so. The Chairman was worried about the height in an area where the other structures were only two stories high. He thought that was as high as the new addition should be, especially as it was near the top of the hill. He was skeptical even of that as he thought the horizontality of the existing building helped introduce the low residential structures around the corner. Mr. Netsch thought that if two more stories were approved, everyone would want to do the same thing, and he thought that if a third story were even considered it would have to be set way back. With these comments the conceptual design was unanimously disapproved.

3. O.G. 85-33, 3350 M Street, N.W.; Forrest-Marbury Associates, commercial/residential restoration and major new construction, conceptual design. The Assistant Secretary said this submission included renovation,

additions, and some demolition of a Category I landmark, and he asked Mrs. Kohler to give the members some historical background on the building. She said it had been built c. 1790 by Uriah Forrest--soldier, member of the Continental Congress, mayor of Georgetown, and friend of George Washington. In this house on 29 March 1791 Washington met with Forrest and other landowners of Georgetown and Carrollsburgh to discuss the boundaries of the Capital City. Final details for transferring the land to the federal government were worked out. Then in 1800 the house was sold to William Marbury who, several years later, was the plaintiff in the historic Marbury vs. Madison case, thus adding to the historic importance of the house. Upon Marbury's death his son, John, moved into the house with his large family, and c. 1853, according to the tax books, made several additions and improvements to the house. From a photo in the HABS collection dated 1860, it would appear that the two-and-one-half gable roof house was enlarged to three full stories and the eastern appendages and southern shed roof addition constructed. Mrs. Kohler said the Marbury family sold the house in 1891 and it was converted into a store with apartments above. From that point on it gradually deteriorated to its present state.

The Assistant Secretary said the Georgetown Board had seen two schemes for side and rear additions. He showed the model for the first scheme, which the Georgetown Board had found too massive. He pointed out that some small, non-historic buildings to the west would be demolished, as would the southern addition to the Marbury house, with its 1850's brick arcade. He then said the Board had considered a new, smaller scheme, called Alternate C, which they found improved but still not acceptable.

The architect, Phillip Renfrow, of Geier, Brown, Renfrow, was then introduced to discuss Alternate C. He said the new scheme would pull the development away from the historic house and give it more prominence. The exterior of the house and its eastern appendages would be restored, although there were no longer any historic interiors to restore. There would be a courtyard behind the house, smaller than in the first scheme, and because of the reduction in height of the rear section, the third floor of the house would be visible from the south. The new development would be four stories high along M Street and rise to six in the rear, because of the grade change, except behind the Forrest-Marbury house, where it would drop to five stories. This scheme would still require the demolition of the arcaded southern addition to the house.

Mr. Netsch said he was disturbed not only by the size and mass of the new additions, but also by the architectural character--particularly the southern elevation, which he thought resembled a resort hotel. He and the other members were concerned also by the dichotomy between the massive rear facade and the row of small, late nineteenth century houses opposite. They stressed the importance of the view of the Forrest-Marbury house from the

canal and the river, and thought an opening should be left so the entire house could be seen. A visitor, architect Belinda Reeder, commented that there was also a fine view from above M Street that should be considered. The members unanimously agreed that the development was much too large to be considered suitable in the immediate vicinity of a Category I landmark, and it was disapproved. Exhibit G

4. O.G. 85-35, 1042, 44 & 46 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.; renovation, demolition, and new hotel; conceptual designs. The Assistant Secretary said this submission was for a small hotel at the corner of Grace Street and Wisconsin Avenue. It would require demolition of the Hawk Welding Company building and leave only the front and side facades of the adjoining building to the south. He asked Mrs. Kohler to give the history of these buildings. She said the Hawk Welding Company had been built by its owners in 1928 and was of little architectural or historical significance. The other building was erected in 1877 for the Washington Chariot Company and still retained its original timber construction inside. It had for years been owned by George Dunlop, a Georgetown hardware merchant and one time president of the Capital Traction Company. She said it was typical of light industrial construction in Georgetown in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The Assistant Secretary said the Georgetown Board had no objection to the demolition of the Hawk Welding building but thought the other should be retained if possible. Before introducing the architect, Thomas Wright, he stressed that this was a preliminary presentation, that the design had not yet been reviewed by the D.C. Historic Preservation Board, and demolition permits had not yet been applied for. Mr. Wright gave further details about the history of the corner lot and then introduced Nancy Noyes to discuss the history of both buildings. She said they were both vernacular structures; the Hawk building was of no importance and the other, while more interesting, had been much altered. The members looked at the drawings for the hotel, which incorporated fragments of the Chariot Company Building and recalled features of the Hawk Welding building. They thought the design was being hampered by the token preservation and historical reference, and the Chairman thought that in future years such an effort would be laughed at. He and the other members unanimously agreed that the buildings could be demolished so that Mr. Wright could start afresh and design a really good, new building in keeping with the Georgetown historic context. Exhibit H

5. O.G. 85-36, 3270 M Street, N.W.; Georgetown Park Phase II, design development, conceptual designs (previous: O.G. 85-18). (Mr. Netsch left the room because of his previous association with the architects, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill). The Assistant Secretary recalled that the Commission had reviewed plans for development around the Market House in September and had disapproved a raised plaza between the old building and the new development. At that time also, the Park Service had objected to the overly elaborate treatment of the entrance to the canal bridge. Since this review, the raised plaza had been removed and the market left on its

original grade, and the entrance to the bridge had been simplified. He said the submission for this meeting concerned a new element--a new ramp to underground parking, located behind the Market House and reached from M Street. He said the Georgetown Board had been opposed to the original scheme (which also included a loading dock) as it obliterated all sense of pedestrian space at the rear of the market. Then a new scheme with no loading dock, a tightened ramp, and a pedestrian plaza overlooking the canal had been submitted. The Board still did not like the idea of a ramp on public space, but thought it the best solution to the problem, and saw the second scheme as an improvement.

Philip Ross, from Western Development, was then introduced. He said his firm had been working with the Georgetown Business and Professional Association to do something about the traffic problem on M Street caused by those waiting to turn and enter the garage from Wisconsin Avenue. An entrance on M Street for those coming from the west seemed the best answer, and in fact had been made a requirement by the District Government in exchange for the closing of East Warehouse Place.

The Chairman said there were two issues: whether there should be an entrance at all, and if so, how it should be designed. He said he was worried about the old market, because the rear was just as important as the front. He thought that in the new scheme the ramp was too close to the building, and that the original position, close to the canal, might be better, although he said the would prefer not to have it at all.

Architect David Childs was introduced to show final drawings for the new building and the new configuration for the plaza east of the market. He introduced preservation architect Hyman Myers to discuss details of the plaza area and grading. Mr. Myers talked about the possible locations for the ramp, the paving patterns in the area (which would be much like those existing), and then commented that since the eastern part of the plaza would not be raised, the windows in the old building would not have to be altered. The ramp was discussed further, with both Mr. Childs and the Chairman agreeing that pedestrians should be able to view the market from the rear, which would not be possible if the ramp were located too near the canal; on the other hand, placing it too close to the building would destroy the integrity of the rear facade. The Chairman said he would like to see more detailed versions and models of several ramp locations. John Jessup from the Park Service was then asked to comment on the new design for the approach to the canal bridge. He said the Park Service was satisfied with the new solution. Therefore, the further development of the building and plaza designs were approved, and the ramp design disapproved. Exhibit I

6. O.G. 85-37, 29th & K Streets, N. W.; new apartment building, revised conceptual designs (previous: O.G. 85-11). Mr. Carson reviewed the previous submission and the attempts to arrive at a satisfactory facade design. He said the Georgetown Board was pleased with the one presented after the last Commission meeting, but had asked for a change in the upper portion of the tower, feeling that it should be raised so as to complement a similar tower on the SOM building adjacent to it. The architect, Robert Schwinn, said he did not object to raising it although he thought it would have more meaning at the lower level for those living in the apartment. The members looked at the drawings and agreed with the Georgetown Board that the design was much improved; it was unanimously approved.

7. O.G. 85-41, 1057 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W.; renovation and restaurant addition, conceptual design (previous: O.G. 85-13). Mr. Carson showed drawings of a revised scheme, keeping more open space along the canal, that the Commission had seen in November. He said this scheme had been approved by the Georgetown Board. The architect, Ian Birchall, said the new construction would be painted brick, like the old house. He pointed out a three bay canvas canopy in the patio, and said that while the canvas would be removed in the winter the supports would remain. Mr. Netsch said he would prefer that the whole structure come down, and Mr. Stone suggested that the large Italian canvas umbrellas be used instead. Mr. Birchall agreed to do this and the project was unanimously approved.

8. O.G. 85-44, 3601 O Street, N. W.; Georgetown University, proposed new residence, conceptual design. Mr. Carson said this would be a large, Georgian type house in an area of 1870's vernacular structures. He said the Georgetown Board had seen the design and asked for more refinement of the details--the dormers, roof, and the elements in the central bay: the scale of the Palladian window, and the entrance, which seemed more nineteenth then eighteenth century. The architect, William Cochran, said the University had asked him to design the house in a style current in 1789, the year the university was founded. The Chairman said he thought the staff could help him find the proper details. Mr. Netsch questioned Mr. Cochran on the open space and the parking area and its visibility from windows of the main rooms. Mr. Cochran said there would be a garden in the open space, and the parking area, at a lower grade and concealed by a wall, would not be noticeable. The conceptual design was unanimously approved, with revised details to be seen later.

9. Appendix I, approved.

Shipstead-Luce Act

Appendix II, approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT A

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 21, 1984

Dear Mr. Berliner:

On behalf of the Commission of Fine Arts, I am happy to approve the modifications to the architectural plans for the Chancery of the Embassy of Canada, as presented to us on December 12, 1984. They strengthen an already excellent design, and we are delighted to see them. The sample of light grey "Niagara Stone" was also viewed and approved.

When final design details are worked out we look forward to reviewing construction drawings as the permit process proceeds. We are particularly pleased by the commitment to avoiding exterior parking on the site, and to design the perimeter security system as an integral part of the building. The disappearing grill, for use when the building is closed, seems an excellent solution to the security needs, and is one of the details which we will look forward to seeing as it is developed.

With all best wishes for the season.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Henry A. Berliner, Jr.
Chairman
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation
425 13th Street, N.W. - Suite 1148
Washington, D.C. 20004

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT B

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 21, 1984

Dear Mr. Berliner:

At its meeting on 12 December 1984 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed plans to place a replica of the William Wetmore Story statue of John Marshall in John Marshall Park. The members had no objection to so doing, and approved the location within the park area. There was concern, however, that the base was too low. It is suggested that the height be considerably increased, and to test the design, a mock-up in silhouette of base and statue is recommended. It was also suggested that some paneling or moulding, recessed deeply enough to form shadows, would give strength to the base.

If the original statue now in the Supreme Court building is to be used to make the replica, then the concurrence of both the Chief Justice and the Architect of the Capitol will have to be obtained; until this is done, the Commission of Fine Arts cannot give final approval to the project. As of this date, we are advised by the Office of the Architect of the Capitol that such concurrence has not yet been requested. We understand from the PADC representative present at the meeting that the Chief Justice's concurrence has been obtained.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Henry A. Berliner, Jr.
Chairman
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation
425 13th Street, N.W. - Suite 1148
Washington, D.C. 20004

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT C

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 21, 1984

Dear Mr. Berliner:

At its meeting on 12 December 1984 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed plans for a sidewalk cafe along the E Street frontage of the J.W. Marriott Hotel. There was no objection to the design, and the members thought the cafe would provide a lively addition to that part of the avenue.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Henry A. Berliner, Jr.
Chairman
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation
425 13th Street, N.W. - Suite 1148
Washington, D.C. 20004

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT D

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 21, 1984

Dear Mr. Fish:

At its 12 December 1984 meeting, the Commission met with Jim McDaniels, John Parsons and Chief Landscape Architect, Merick Smith, to review plans for renovations to East Executive Avenue, between the White House and the Old Treasury Building. The members were pleased with the concept and confident that the project will prove worthy of the symbolic nature and architectural importance of its setting. To reach that goal, every effort should be made to secure the finest materials and design possible.

With this end in mind, the Commission would like to pass on to you several minor recommendations. While the general design of the proposed security gates is approved, the secondary posts dividing the pedestrian entrances into three bays should be reduced in scale to balance better with the vehicular entrance gates on the other side. To reduce the clutter of the visual axis down East Executive Avenue, the information kiosks should be placed in the planter beds to the side of the pedestrian entrances parallel with and adjacent to the White House fence and wall.

The proposed fountain would benefit by additional study with a mock-up on the site. As its footprint must be modest in size, we want to be assured that any vertical elements are in keeping with its small scale in that large outdoor setting. Perhaps a fundamentally horizontal solution, as far as structure is concerned, might work better, with the water jets providing the vertical design elements. Lastly, a simulation of the worst possible conditions may help to determine the durability of the proposed pavers and the support system underlying the lawns when subjected to the heavy loads of buses and trucks that are inevitable.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
HAROLD BURSON — WALTER A. NETSCH
JOHN S. CHASE — ALAN R. NOVAK
SONDRA G. MYERS — EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT E

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 21, 1984

Dear Mayor Barry:

At the request of one of our Commission members, the Business and Professional Association of Georgetown was invited to present its study for the Whitehurst Freeway at our meeting on December 12, 1984. I know you are aware of their efforts, and since their plans have been mentioned in connection with some of our own concerns for the overall development of the Georgetown waterfront, we thought it advisable to learn a little more about the specifics.

I would like to report that on the basis of their presentation, there appears to be much to recommend their proposal. All of us would like to find a way to get rid of the present freeway. If what they say is true about the costs of their scheme compared with the one currently favored by highway officials, and the benefits to through traffic as well as to the citizens and users of Georgetown, then I certainly believe it would be in the public interest to reopen the issue before going ahead with final plans. The alternative of perpetuating the existing eyesore for another thirty or forty years is grave to contemplate if there is a better way out.

We therefore hope you will ask your highway planners to reconsider their current position and give this most worthy alternative a fair hearing. It may be our last chance for a long while to make a lasting contribution to this section of the waterfront, and thus to the city as a whole.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Marion S. Barry, Jr.
Mayor of the District of Columbia
Suite 520
District Building
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT F

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 21, 1984

RE: O.G. 85-43

Dear Ms. Thompson:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed conceptual designs for a condominium apartment/retail project at the southeast corner of Wisconsin Avenue and Reservoir Street, N.W., during its December 12, 1984 meeting. After reviewing the plans and listening to testimony from the developer's representative and from nearby residents, the Commission disapproved the proposal with the recommendation that any restudy for the project focus on a solution to the following concerns:

First, the new residential structure proposed for construction on the existing open space to the rear of the three buildings fronting on Wisconsion Avenue should be much smaller. Both the houses to the east on Reservoir Street and the three buildings on Wisconsin are small-scaled, two-and three-story structures, and the new condominium unit should be compatible. The introduction of a curb-cut and a garage entrance reaching up to eye level will not present to the public a sense of preserved open space from the street, however it reads in plan.

Secondly, the design of the new structure should reflect the general character of the adjacent structures by either incorporating or otherwise making reference to their distinctive architectural features such as roof shapes, cornices, dormers, chimneys, character of openings and materials. Full height glazing of the attic story such as appeared in the proposed design is inappropriate and should be eliminated.

Finally, the restoration and refurbishing of the three old buildings on Wisconsin Avenue should reinforce their essential character. In particular, additions on the rear of the house on the corner should be retained and repaired, although there is no objection to the removal of the recent box-like addition on the front of this structure provided that the new materials and design are consistent with the character of the original building. It should be emphasised that the Commission discourages any scheme based on reconstruction rather than the restoration of the existing fabric.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Carol B. Thompson
Director
Department of Consumer & Regulatory Affairs
614 H Street, N.W. - Room 307
Washington, D.C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT G

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 21, 1984

RE: O.G. 85-33

Dear Ms. Thompson:

I am writing to report on the Commission's actions on plans for renovations of and new additions to the Forrest/Marbury House at 3350 M Street, N.W., which we reviewed at our meeting on December 12, 1984.

Chief among our concerns is the excessive size of the new construction to the south of this Category I landmark. It obscures the historic view of the south elevation which has been a familiar element appearing in the earliest photographs of Georgetown. The building mass should be reduced and reconfigured in order to provide greater visibility from Key Bridge, the Potomac, and the Virginia shore.

Secondly, the Commission is opposed to the demolition of the rear porch and arcaded addition, features that date from at least the Civil War era as evidenced from photographs of the period. Its removal would result in a significant lessening of the contributing value of the house to the historic district and should not be permitted.

Finally, it should be noted that a new park commemorating the nearby site of the house of Francis Scott Key is to be located immediately west of the Forrest/Marbury House. Together these two sites will comprise one of the more important historic elements in the development of our Capital, a fact that calls for the utmost restraint of new development, and for most careful respect in preserving these important sites.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Carol B. Thompson
Director
Department of Consumer & Regulatory Affairs
614 H Street, N.W. - Room 307
Washington, D.C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT H

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 21, 1984

Dear Ms. Thompson:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed a conceptual proposal for demolition and new construction at 1042, 44, and 46 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., (O.G. 85-35) during its December 12, 1984 meeting. The proposal for a small hotel included a partial demolition of 1042, and full demolition of 1044 Wisconsin Avenue as well as new construction for the entire site. The Commission disapproved the plans as submitted and has returned them to the architect for another design based on the clearing of the site and totally new construction.

First, we do not feel that the character of the two existing buildings merits retention of portions of them as remnants. Little remains of the original character of either building, and even if restored, it is questionable whether their continued presence on the site would be an asset.

Secondly, we feel that the proposed design, which would incorporate fragments of 1042 Wisconsin and recall features of 1044 Wisconsin, is not satisfactory, and given the requirement to retain the old fragments, is not likely to improve. By divorcing the design from the existing buildings, a capable architect will stand a better chance of producing a well scaled, well proportioned, carefully detailed building.

We feel that it is good to retain existing buildings when they can make a contribution to the historic district, but when it appears that by doing so we hinder the design process, other choices must be made.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Carol B. Thompson
Director
Department of Consumer & Regulatory Affairs
614 H Street, N.W. - Room 307
Washington, D.C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN B. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT I

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 21, 1984

Dear Ms. Thompson:

I am submitting the following comments and recommendations with reference to the Commission's continuing review of Phase II at Georgetown Park (3270 M Street, N.W., O.G. 85-36) which was considered at our meeting on December 12, 1984:

- The concept of a new garage entrance ramp located at the rear of the Old Georgetown Market is approved. While the Commission would rather see no further intrusion of vehicular traffic in this unique pedestrian circulation space, it is preferred over another curb-cut and garage entrance on M Street where the effect on pedestrian circulation would be at least as bad if not worse than the proposed location.

- The details for this new entrance ramp are not approved. The Commission is concerned about the proximity to the old market building and the C and O Canal and requests a more thorough study of the design, including a model at good scale of the entrance ramp and its immediate context.

- The revised design for the paved area on East Market Space that separates the market from the new extension of Georgetown Park is approved. Previous recommendations of the Commission have been incorporated in the new design, and we are assured that the plans now reflect the traditional setting of the Market.

- The revised elevations of the new extension (principally the west and south elevations) are approved.

- The revised designs for the stairs and landscape elements related to the Canal are approved. Details should be submitted, particularly for lighting fixtures.

With regard to the closing of Warehouse Alley, we feel the developer has met the conditions for general approval of the new access ramp and have no objection to the enactment of the pending legislation.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Carol B. Thompson
Director
Department of Consumer & Regulatory Affairs
614 H Street, N.W. - Room 307
Washington, D.C. 20001